

APPENDIX B

**TO PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
ON COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL/ISSUE PRECLUSION IN
RELATION TO MOTION TO STAY**

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. 99-2496 (GK)

and

TOBACCO-FREE KIDS ACTION FUND,

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY,

AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION,

AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION,

AMERICANS FOR NONSMOKERS' RIGHTS,

and NATIONAL AFRICAN AMERICAN

TOBACCO PREVENTION NETWORK,

Intervenors,

v.

PHILIP MORRIS USA, INC.,

(f/k/a Philip Morris, Inc.), *et al.*,

Defendants.

FINAL OPINION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Overview	1
	B. Preliminary Guidance for the Reader	5
II.	PROCEDURAL HISTORY	10
III.	CREATION, NATURE, AND OPERATION OF THE ENTERPRISE	15
	A. Pre-1953 Overview—The Rise in American Smoking and the Status of Scientific Research on Smoking and Health	16
	B. Creation of the Enterprise	18
	C. TIRC/CTR -- Tobacco Industry Research Committee/Council for Tobacco Research-USA	26
	1. Selection and Approval of TIRC's Scientific Advisory Board Members and Scientific Director	37
	2. Research Activities of TIRC/CTR	43
	3. Public Relations Activities of TIRC/CTR	50
	4. Publications and Public Statements of TIRC/CTR	55
	a. TIRC/CTR Annual Reports	55
	b. TIRC/CTR Newsletters	59
	c. TIRC/CTR Press Releases and Other Public Statements	62
	D. Tobacco Institute	65
	1. Formation of the Tobacco Institute	65
	2. Relationship Between the Tobacco Institute and TIRC/CTR	73

3.	Tobacco Institute Press Releases, Public Statements, Advertisements, Brochures, and Other Publications	81
4.	Tobacco Institute Committees	93
a.	Committee of Counsel and Outside Counsel	94
b.	Tobacco Institute Executive Committee	99
c.	Tobacco Institute Communications Committee	101
5.	Tobacco Institute College of Tobacco Knowledge	103
6.	Tobacco Institute Testing Laboratory	110
E.	Joint Research Activity Directed by Defendants' Executives and Lawyers	110
1.	Witness Development	110
2.	CTR Special Projects	119
a.	Nature of CTR Special Projects	119
b.	Lawyers' Involvement with CTR Special Projects	124
c.	Scientists Funded Through CTR Special Projects	135
3.	Lawyers' Special Accounts	136
a.	Special Account No. 3	137
b.	Special Account No. 4	138
c.	Special Account No. 5	146
d.	Institutional Grants	147
F.	Committees	149
1.	Research Review Committee, Research Liaison Committee, and Industry Research Committee	149

2.	Industry Technical Committee	154
3.	Tobacco Working Group	157
G.	Coordinated Smoking and Health Literature Collection and Retrieval	163
H.	Defendants' Organizations Focused on ETS Issues	168
I.	International Organizations, Committees, and Groups	170
1.	Overview	170
2.	TMSC -- Tobacco Manufacturers' Standing Committee	176
3.	TRC -- Tobacco Research Council	180
4.	TAC -- Tobacco Advisory Council	182
5.	ICOSI -- International Committee on Smoking Issues	187
6.	INFOTAB -- International Tobacco Information Center	193
7.	TDC -- Tobacco Documentation Centre	198
8.	CORESTA -- Center for Cooperation in Scientific Research Relative to Tobacco/Centre de Coopération pour les Recherches Scientifiques Relatives au Tabac	200
9.	Tobacco Institute Interaction with Overseas and International Groups	201
J.	Dissolution of CTR and the Tobacco Institute	210
1.	CTR	210
2.	Tobacco Institute	212
IV.	THE DEFENDANTS ARE ENGAGED IN AND THEIR ACTIVITIES AFFECT INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE	213
A.	Philip Morris Companies	214

B.	Philip Morris	214
C.	R.J. Reynolds	214
D.	Liggett	214
E.	Lorillard	215
F.	BATCo	215
G.	Brown & Williamson	215
H.	American	215
I.	Tobacco Institute	216
J.	TIRC/CTR	218
V.	DEFENDANTS DEVISED AND EXECUTED A SCHEME TO DEFRAUD CONSUMERS AND POTENTIAL CONSUMERS OF CIGARETTES IN MOST, BUT NOT ALL, OF THE AREAS ALLEGED BY THE GOVERNMENT	219
A.	Defendants Have Falsely Denied, Distorted and Minimized the Significant Adverse Health Consequences of Smoking for Decades	219
1.	Cigarette Smoking Causes Disease	219
2.	Scientific Research on Lung Cancer up to December 1953	222
a.	Scientists Investigating the Rise in the Incidence of Lung Cancer Linked Smoking and Disease before 1953	222
b.	By 1953, Defendants Recognized the Need for Concerted Action to Confront Accumulating Evidence of the Serious Consequences of Smoking	232
3.	Developments Between 1953 and 1964	236

a.	Between 1953 and 1964, the Evidence Demonstrating that Smoking Causes Significant Adverse Health Effects Grew Although No Consensus Had Yet Been Reached	236
b.	Before 1964, Defendants Internally Recognized the Growing Evidence Demonstrating that Smoking Causes Significant Adverse Health Effects	251
c.	In the 1950s, Defendants Began Their Joint Campaign to Falsely Deny and Distort the Existence of a Link Between Cigarette Smoking and Disease, Even Though Their Internal Documents Recognized Its Existence	259
4.	The 1964 Surgeon General Report Represented a Scientific Consensus that Smoking Causes Disease	269
a.	The Process and Methodology of the Surgeon General's Report	269
b.	The Conclusions	275
5.	Post-1964 Research on the Adverse Health Effects of Smoking and Defendants' Persistent Denials Thereof	278
a.	Following Publication of the 1964 Report, the Scientific Community Continued to Document the Link Between Smoking and an Extraordinary Number of Serious Health Consequences	278
b.	Defendants' Internal Documents and Research from the 1960s, 1970s, and Beyond Reveal Their Continued Recognition that Smoking Causes Serious Adverse Health Effects and Their Fear of the Impact of Such Knowledge on Litigation	279
c.	Despite Their Internal Knowledge, Defendants Continued, From 1964 Onward, to Falsely Deny and Distort the Serious Health Effects of Smoking	293

6.	As of 2005, Defendants Still Do Not Admit the Serious Health Effects of Smoking Which They Recognized Internally Decades Ago	324
7.	Conclusions	330
B.	<u>The Addictive Properties of Nicotine</u>	332
1.	Introduction	332
2.	Cigarette Smoking Is Addictive and Nicotine Is the Primary Element of that Addiction	333
a.	How Nicotine Operates within the Body	333
b.	Evolving Definitions of "Addiction" and Classification of Nicotine	336
c.	Consequences of the Addictiveness of Nicotine	346
d.	Conclusion	349
3.	Defendants Were Well Aware that Smoking and Nicotine Are Addictive	350
a.	Philip Morris	352
b.	R.J. Reynolds	374
c.	BATCo	385
d.	Brown & Williamson	422
e.	Lorillard	436
f.	American Tobacco Company	441
g.	CTR	443
4.	Defendants Publicly Denied that Nicotine Is Addictive and Continue to Do So	445
a.	Philip Morris	447

b.	R.J. Reynolds	451
c.	BATCo	456
d.	American Tobacco Company	459
e.	Brown & Williamson	459
f.	Lorillard	461
g.	Liggett	463
h.	Tobacco Institute	463
i.	CTR	473
j.	Defendants' Conduct Continues	474
5.	Defendants Concealed and Suppressed Research Data and Other Evidence that Nicotine Is Addictive	479
a.	Philip Morris	481
b.	BATCo	493
c.	Brown & Williamson	495
d.	American Tobacco Company	504
e.	Tobacco Institute	505
f.	CTR and Other Defendant Funded Research Groups	505
6.	Conclusions	512
C.	Nicotine "Manipulation": Defendants Have Falsely Denied that They Can and Do Control the Level of Nicotine Delivered In Order to Create and Sustain Addiction	515
1.	For Decades, Defendants Have Recognized that Controlling Nicotine Delivery, in Order to Create and Sustain Smokers' Addiction, Was Necessary to Ensure Commercial Success	516

a.	Defendants Recognized the Need to Determine "Minimum" and "Optimum" Nicotine Delivery Levels in Order to Provide Sufficient "Impact" and "Satisfaction" to Cigarette Smokers	517
(1)	Philip Morris	519
(2)	R.J. Reynolds	521
(3)	Brown & Williamson and BATCo	525
(4)	Lorillard	526
(5)	Liggett	527
b.	Defendants Have Long Recognized that Controlling the Nicotine to Tar Ratio Would Enable Them to Meet Minimum and Optimum Nicotine Delivery Levels	528
(1)	Philip Morris	528
(2)	R.J. Reynolds	535
(3)	Brown & Williamson and BATCo	546
(4)	American	552
(5)	Lorillard	553
(6)	Liggett	560
c.	Defendants Understood the Correlation Between Nicotine Delivery and Cigarette Sales	561
(1)	Philip Morris	561
(2)	R.J. Reynolds	562
(3)	Brown & Williamson and BATCo	564
(4)	Lorillard	566

2.	Defendants Researched, Developed, and Utilized Various Designs and Methods of Nicotine Control to Ensure that All Cigarettes Delivered Doses of Nicotine Adequate to Create and Sustain Addiction	567
a.	Defendants Recognized the Need to Design Cigarettes that Would Produce Low Nicotine and Tar Measurements under the FTC Method While Also Delivering the Minimum Nicotine Levels to Create and Sustain Addiction	570
b.	Leaf Blend and Filler: Defendants Controlled the Amount and Form of Nicotine Delivery in Their Commercial Products by Controlling the Physical and Chemical Make-Up of the Tobacco Blend and Filler	572
(1)	Philip Morris	575
(2)	R.J. Reynolds	578
(3)	Brown & Williamson and BATCo	580
(4)	American	583
(5)	Lorillard	587
(6)	Liggett	589
c.	Nicotine to Tar Ratio: Defendants Have Used Physical Design Parameters to Increase the Nicotine to Tar Ratio of Their Cigarettes	589
(1)	Filter Design	592
(2)	Ventilation and Air Dilution	593
(3)	Paper Porosity and Composition	594
d.	Smoke pH and Ammonia: Defendants Altered the Chemical Form of Nicotine Delivered in Mainstream Cigarette Smoke for the Purpose of Improving Nicotine Transfer Efficiency and Increasing the Speed with Which Nicotine Is Absorbed by Smokers	596

	(1) Scientific Overview	596
	(2) Individual Defendants' Documents	605
	(a) Philip Morris	605
	(b) R.J. Reynolds	610
	(c) Brown & Williamson and BATCo	617
	(d) American	627
	(e) Lorillard	628
	(f) Liggett	631
e.	Other Additives: Defendants Researched the Use of Other Additives to Control Nicotine Delivery	633
3.	Defendants Have Made False and Misleading Public Statements Regarding Their Control of the Nicotine Content and Delivery of Their Products	636
a.	The Waxman Hearings	637
b.	Defendants' False and Misleading Public Statements Continued After the Waxman Hearings	646
c.	Testimony Consistent with Fraudulent Public Statements	651
4.	Conclusions	653
D.	The Government Has Failed to Prove by a Preponderance of the Evidence that Defendants Deliberately Chose Not to Utilize or Market Feasible Designs or Product Features that Could Produce Less Hazardous Cigarettes	655
1.	Introduction	655
2.	Defendants Have Long Acknowledged Internally the Existence of a Market for a Genuinely Less Hazardous Cigarette	656

3.	Defendants Received Conflicting Messages From the Government and the Public Health Community About Their Efforts to Create and Market Less Hazardous Cigarettes	658
4.	As Part of the Effort to Make Less Hazardous Cigarettes, Defendants Experimented with General and Selective Reduction	663
a.	General Reduction	663
b.	Selective Reduction	667
(1)	Defendants' Efforts to Reduce Benzo(a)pyrene	668
(2)	Defendants' Efforts to Reduce Phenols Through Use of Charcoal Filtered Cigarettes	669
(a)	Philip Morris	672
(b)	RJ Reynolds	673
(c)	Lorillard's York Cigarette	675
(3)	Defendants' Efforts to Reduce Ciliastats	676
(4)	Defendants' Efforts to Reduce Delivery of Tobacco-Specific Nitrosamines	677
5.	Defendants' Efforts to Develop/Market Potentially Less Hazardous Non-Conventional Products	682
a.	Philip Morris	682
(1)	Accord	682
(2)	Next	685
(3)	Nicotine Analogue Program	687
b.	RJ Reynolds	688
(1)	The Multijet Filter	688
(2)	Heated Tobacco Products	690

	(a) Premier	690
	(b) Eclipse	703
	(3) EW/Winston Select	712
c.	BATCo and Brown & Williamson	721
	(1) FACT Cigarette	721
	(2) Project Ariel	722
	(3) Project Airbus	723
	(4) Advance	726
d.	Lorillard's Zero Tar and PMO Projects	731
e.	Liggett's Project XA	732
6.	The Government Has Not Proven by a Preponderance of the Evidence that Defendant Had a "Gentleman's Agreement" Not to Develop a Less Hazardous Cigarette and Not to Do In-House Biological Research on the Hazards of Smoking	734
7.	Conclusions	738
E.	Defendants Falsey Marketed and Promoted Low Tar/Light Cigarettes as Less Harmful than Full-Flavor Cigarettes in Order to Keep People Smoking and Sustain Corporate Revenues	740
1.	Low Tar/Light Cigarettes Offer No Clear Health Benefit over Regular Cigarettes	742
a.	History of Health Claims	742
b.	The FTC Method	746
c.	The FTC Method Does Not Measure Actual Tar and Nicotine Delivery	750

d.	The Public Health Community Has Concluded that Low Tar Cigarettes Offer No Clear Health Benefit	765
2.	Based on Their Sophisticated Understanding of Compensation, Defendants Internally Recognized that Low Tar/Light Cigarettes Offer No Clear Health Benefit	786
a.	Defendants Internally Recognized that Low Tar Cigarettes Are Not Less Harmful Than Full-Flavor Cigarettes	786
(1)	Philip Morris	786
(2)	RJ Reynolds	770
(3)	Brown & Williamson	791
(4)	BATCo	793
(5)	Lorillard	793
(6)	Liggett	794
b.	Internally, Defendants Had an Extensive and Sophisticated Understanding of Smoker Compensation	794
(1)	Philip Morris	796
(2)	RJ Reynolds	806
(3)	Brown & Williamson	809
(4)	BATCo	811
(5)	American Tobacco	817
(6)	Lorillard	817
3.	Defendants Internally Recognized that Smokers Switch to Low Tar/Light Cigarettes, Rather than Quit Smoking, Because They Believe They Are Less Harmful	819
a.	Defendants Recognized that Smokers Choose Light/Low Tar Cigarettes for a Perceived Health Benefit	822

(1)	Philip Morris	822
(2)	R.J. Reynolds	831
(3)	Brown & Williamson	834
(4)	BATCo	838
(5)	American Tobacco	840
(6)	Lorillard	842
b.	Defendants Internally Recognized that Smokers Rely on the Claims Made for Low Tar/Light Cigarettes as an Excuse/ Rationale for Not Quitting Smoking	843
(1)	Tobacco Institute	843
(2)	Philip Morris	843
(3)	R.J. Reynolds	850
(4)	Brown & Williamson	855
(5)	BATCo	858
(6)	American Tobacco	861
(7)	Lorillard	862
(8)	Liggett	864
4.	Despite Their Internal Knowledge, Defendants Publicly Denied that Compensation Is Nearly Complete and that the FTC Method is Flawed	864
a.	Tobacco Institute	871
b.	Philip Morris	872
c.	RJ Reynolds	874
d.	Brown & Williamson	875

e.	BATCo	876
f.	American Tobacco	877
g.	Lorillard	877
5.	Despite Their Internal Knowledge, Defendants' Marketing and Public Statements About Low Tar Cigarettes Continue to Suggest that They Are Less Harmful than Full-Flavor Cigarettes	877
a.	Philip Morris	887
(1)	Philip Morris's Low Tar Cigarette Marketing Techniques	887
(2)	Philip Morris's Research on the Low Tar Cigarette Category	907
(3)	Philip Morris's Public Statements About Low Tar Cigarettes	911
b.	R.J. Reynolds	916
(1)	R.J. Reynolds's Low Tar Marketing Techniques	916
(2)	R.J. Reynolds's Research on the Low Tar Cigarette Category	926
(3)	RJR's Public Statements About Low Tar Cigarettes	929
c.	Brown & Williamson	930
(1)	Brown & Williamson's Marketing of Low Tar Cigarettes	930
(2)	Brown & Williamson's Research on the Low Tar Cigarette Category	935
(3)	Brown & Williamson's Public Statements About Low Tar Cigarettes	944
d.	BATCo	946

(1)	BATCo's Research on the Low Tar Cigarette Category	946
(2)	BATCo's Public Statements About Low Tar Cigarettes	951
e.	American Tobacco Marketing of Low Tar Cigarettes	952
f.	Lorillard	959
(1)	Lorillard's Marketing of Low Tar Cigarettes	959
(2)	Lorillard's Research on the Low Tar Cigarette Category	966
g.	Liggett	970
6.	Conclusions	970
F.	From the 1950s to the Present, Different Defendants, at Different Times and Using Different Methods, Have Intentionally Marketed to Young People Under the Age of Twenty-One in Order to Recruit "Replacement Smokers" to Ensure the Economic Future of the Tobacco Industry	972
1.	Definition of Youth	972
2.	The Defendants Need Youth as Replacement Smokers	973
3.	Defendants' Marketing Is a Substantial Contributing Factor to Youth Smoking Initiation	980
a.	Development of the Link Between Marketing and Youth Smoking	980
(1)	No Single-Source Causative Factor Can Describe the Complex Link Between Marketing and Youth Smoking	980
(2)	Public Health Authorities Have Found that Marketing Is a Substantial Contributing Factor to Youth Smoking Initiation	981

(3)	Independent Studies Have Found that Marketing Is a Substantial Contributing Factor to Youth Smoking Initiation	986
(4)	Credible Expert Witnesses Have Found that Marketing Is a Substantial Contributing Factor to Youth Smoking Initiation	989
b.	The Ubiquity of Defendants' Marketing Normalizes and Legitimizes Smoking for Youth	997
c.	Risk Perception: The Inability of Youth to Grasp the Full Implications of Smoking	1000
4.	Tracking Youth Behavior and Preferences Ensures that Marketing and Promotion Reach Youth	1006
a.	Defendants Track Youth Behavior and Preferences	1006
(1)	Philip Morris	1007
(2)	Lorillard	1031
(3)	American Tobacco, BATCo, and Brown & Williamson	1039
(4)	R.J. Reynolds	1054
b.	Defendants' Marketing Employs Themes Which Resonate with Youth	1071
(1)	Philip Morris	1072
(2)	Lorillard	1082
(3)	Brown & Williamson	1087
(4)	R.J. Reynolds	1096
c.	Defendants Continue Price Promotions for Premium Brands Which Are Most Popular with Teens	1112
(1)	Philip Morris	1114

(2)	Liggett	1119
(3)	Lorillard	1119
(4)	Brown & Williamson	1120
(5)	R.J. Reynolds	1120
5.	Defendants' Marketing Successfully Reaches Youth	1122
a.	Defendants' Spending on Marketing and Promotion Has Continually Increased	1122
b.	Defendants Advertise in Youth-Oriented Publications	1125
(1)	Philip Morris	1126
(2)	Liggett	1134
(3)	Lorillard	1135
(4)	Brown & Williamson	1137
(5)	R.J. Reynolds	1139
c.	Defendants Market to Youth Through Direct Mail	1143
(1)	Philip Morris	1143
(2)	Lorillard	1146
(3)	Brown & Williamson	1148
(4)	R.J. Reynolds	1149
d.	Defendants Market to Youth Through an Array of Retail Promotions	1149
e.	Defendants' Promotional Items, Events and Sponsorships Attract Youth	1156
(1)	Events	1156

	(2) Sponsorships	1158
	(3) Promotional Items	1163
6.	Defendants' Youth Smoking Prevention Programs Are Not Designed to Effectively Prevent Youth Smoking	1164
7.	Despite the Overwhelming Evidence to the Contrary, Defendants' Public Statements and Official or Internal Corporate Policies Deny that Their Marketing Targets Youth or Affects Youth Smoking Incidence	1173
a.	Defendants Claim They Restrict Their Marketing to People Twenty-one and Older	1173
	(1) The 1964 Advertising Code	1174
	(2) Official Corporate Policies	1177
b.	Defendants Deny Their Marketing Influences Youth Smoking Initiation; Defendants' Explanation for Their Marketing Practices Is Not Credible	1180
	(1) Tobacco Institute	1181
	(2) Philip Morris	1190
	(3) Liggett	1195
	(4) Lorillard	1195
	(5) BATCo and Brown & Williamson	1198
	(6) RJ Reynolds	1202
8.	Conclusions	1207
G.	Defendants Have Publicly Denied What They Internally Acknowledged: that ETS Is Hazardous to Nonsmokers	1210
1.	Introduction	1210

2.	The Consensus of the Public Health Community Is that ETS Causes Disease in Nonsmokers	1211
	a. The Development of the Consensus	1215
	b. The Consensus	1230
3.	Internally, Defendants Recognized that ETS Is Hazardous to Nonsmokers	1239
	a. ETS Research at Philip Morris's Institut für Biologische Forschung (INBIFO)	1240
	b. Defendants' Recognition of the Validity of the Hirayama Study	1253
	c. Other Internal Research and Statements Revealing Defendants' Knowledge of the Health Risks of Passive Smoking	1255
4.	Internally, Defendants Expressed Concern that the Mounting Evidence on ETS Posed a Grave Threat to Their Industry	1259
5.	Defendants Made Public Promises to Support Independent Research on the Link Between ETS and Disease	1264
6.	Defendants Undertook Joint Efforts to Undermine and Discredit the Scientific Consensus that ETS Causes Disease	1266
	a. Defendants Acted Through a Web of Coordinated and Interrelated International and Domestic Organizations ..	1266
	(1) 1975-1980: The Tobacco Institute ETS Advisory Group	1266
	(2) 1977-1991: "Operation Berkshire"	1273
	(3) 1987: Operation Downunder	1282
	(4) 1988-1999: The Center for Indoor Air Research (CIAR)	1287
	(a) CIAR Applied Projects	1294

(b)	Defendants Cultivated CIAR's Apparent Independence	1301
(c)	The Demise of CIAR	1307
(5)	Post-1991: IEMC	1308
(6)	The Global ETS Consultancy Program	1319
(a)	Establishment and Goals of the ETS Consultancy Program	1319
(b)	Implementation of the ETS Consultancy Program: Recruiting, Training, and Educating the Consultants	1321
(c)	The Indoor Air Pollution Advisory Group (IAPAG)	1328
(d)	The Appearance of "Independence"	1330
(e)	Defendants' Use of Consultants	1333
(f)	ARIA and IAI	1336
(g)	The Industry's ETS Consultants Cited and/or Published Without Disclosure of Tobacco Industry Ties	1340
(h)	ACVA/HBI	1343
(7)	ETS Symposia	1346
(a)	The 1974 Bermuda (Rylander) "Workshop"	1347
(b)	The Geneva (Rylander) Conference	1349
(c)	The Vienna Conference	1353
(d)	The 1987 Tokyo Conference	1356
(e)	The 1989 McGill "Symposium"	1359

b.	Defendants and Their Paid Consultants Controlled ETS Research Findings	1364
	(1) The 1995 Japanese Spousal Study	1364
	(2) The 1989 Malmfors/SAS Airline Study	1372
	(3) The 1992 HBI 585 Building Study	1377
	(4) The 2003 Enstrom/Kabat Study	1380
7.	Defendants Made False and Misleading Public Statements Denying that ETS Is Hazardous to Nonsmokers	1384
8.	Defendants Continue to Obscure the Fact that ETS is Hazardous to Nonsmokers	1397
	a. Websites and Other Public Statements	1397
	b. The Philip Morris External Research Program (PMERP)	1402
	c. Other Initiatives	1405
9.	Conclusions	1406
H.	At Various Times, Defendants Attempted to and Did Suppress and Conceal Scientific Research and Destroy Documents Relevant to Their Public and Litigation Positions	1407
1.	Suppression and Concealment of Scientific Research	1408
	a. R.J. Reynolds	1409
	b. BAT Group	1414
	c. Philip Morris	1424
	d. Lorillard	1432
2.	Document Destruction Policies	1432
	a. BAT Group	1432

b.	R.J. Reynolds	1463
3.	Improper use of Attorney-Client and Work Product Privileges	1464
a.	BAT Group	1465
b.	R.J. Reynolds	1471
c.	Liggett	1472
d.	Findings by Other Courts	1473
4.	Conclusions	1477
VI.	THE PROVISIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS BY DEFENDANTS	1478
A.	Liggett's Settlement Agreement with Various States	1478
B.	The Master Settlement Agreement	1481
1.	Provisions of the MSA	1481
2.	Enforcement of the MSA	1486
3.	Developments Since the MSA	1492
VII.	DEFENDANTS HAVE VIOLATED 18 U.S.C. 1962(c)	1498
A.	Introduction	1498
B.	Defendants Engaged in a Scheme to Defraud Smokers and Potential Smokers	1501
1.	Defendants Falsely Denied the Adverse Health Effects of Smoking	1505
2.	Defendants Falsely Denied that Nicotine and Smoking Are Addictive	1508

3.	Defendants Falsely Denied that They Manipulated Cigarette Design and Composition so as to Assure Nicotine Delivery Levels Which Create and Sustain Addiction	1512
4.	Defendants Falsely Represented that Light and Low Tar Cigarettes Deliver Less Nicotine and Tar and, Therefore, Present Fewer Health Risks than Full-Flavor Cigarettes	1514
5.	Defendants Falsely Denied that They Market to Youth	1518
6.	Defendants Falsely Denied that ETS Causes Disease	1522
7.	Defendants Suppressed Documents, Information, and Research	1526
C.	Defendants Established an Enterprise	1528
1.	Applicable Legal Standards	1528
2.	Defendants' Enterprise Had a Common Purpose	1530
3.	The Enterprise operated through both formal and informal organization	1532
4.	The Enterprise Has Functioned as a Continuous Unit	1534
D.	The Enterprise Engaged in and Its Activities Affected Interstate and Foreign Commerce	1536
E.	Each Defendant Was Associated with, but Distinct from, the Enterprise	1539
1.	Each Defendant Is Associated with the Enterprise	1539
2.	Each Defendant is Distinct from the Enterprise	1542
F.	Each Defendant Participated in the Conduct of the Enterprise	1542
G.	Each Defendant Carried Out Its Participation in the Conduct of the Enterprise by Engaging in a Pattern of Racketeering Activity	1548

1.	The Government Has Proven that Defendants Caused Mailings and Wire Transmissions, in Furtherance of the Scheme to Defraud, in Violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and/or 1343	1548
a.	Defendants' Routine Mailing Practices	1552
(1)	Philip Morris	1553
(2)	Lorillard	1553
(3)	Liggett	1553
(4)	R.J. Reynolds	1554
(5)	The Tobacco Institute	1554
(6)	Council For Tobacco Research	1554
b.	Prior Stipulations and Admissions Establish the Mailings and Wire Transmissions Underlying 79 of the Alleged 145 Racketeering Acts	1555
c.	The Mailings and Wire Transmissions Underlying the Alleged Racketeering Acts Which Involve Defendants' Press Releases and Advertisements Were Disseminated to the Public Via the United States Mails and Wire Transmissions	1555
d.	Defendants Caused Wire, Radio, and Television Transmissions Underlying the Racketeering Acts	1557
e.	The Mailings and Wire Transmissions Involving Communications Were Sent or Received by Defendants or their Representatives	1558
f.	The Cigarette Company Defendants Are Liable for the Mailings and Wire Transmissions Underlying the Racketeering Acts Committed By Defendants CTR and TI ..	1560
2.	The First Amendment Does Not Protect Defendants' False and Misleading Public Statements	1562

a.	<u>Noerr-Pennington Protects Only Those Defendants' Statements Made in the Course of Petitioning the Legislature; It Does Not Immunize Statements Made with the Purpose of Influencing Smokers, Potential Smokers, and the General Public</u>	1563
b.	The Government Has Met the Necessary Standard of Proof to Show that Defendants' Actions Are Fraudulent	1564
3.	Defendants Engaged in a Pattern of Racketeering Activity in Furtherance of the Scheme to Defraud	1566
a.	Each Defendant Committed at Least Two Racketeering Acts, the Last One of Which Occurred Within Ten Years from the Commission of the Prior Racketeering Act	1566
b.	The Racketeering Acts Are Related and Continuous	1568
(1)	The Racketeering Acts Are Related	1568
(2)	The Racketeering Acts Have Been Continuous	1570
4.	Defendants Acted with the Specific Intent to Defraud or Deceive ..	1571
a.	Defendants Are Liable for the Acts of Their Officers, Employees, and Agents	1572
b.	Defendants Are Deemed to Possess the Collective Knowledge of Their Officers, Employees, and Agents	1575
c.	Specific Intent May Be Established by the Collective Knowledge of Each Defendant and of the Enterprise as a Whole	1578
5.	Defendants' False and Fraudulent Statements, Representations, and Promises Were Material	1583
VIII.	DEFENDANTS HAVE VIOLATED 18 U.S.C. §1962(d)	1588
A.	Applicable Case Law	1588
B.	Each Defendant Is Liable for the RICO Conspiracy Charge Because Each Entered into the Requisite Conspiratorial Agreement	1591

C.	Liggett Withdrew from the Conspiracy	1597
IX.	ALTRIA IS LIABLE FOR ITS VIOLATIONS OF 18 U.S.C. §1962(c) and (d)	1599
X.	THERE IS A LIKELIHOOD OF PRESENT AND FUTURE VIOLATIONS OF RICO	1601
A.	Applicable Law	1601
B.	The Enterprise's Scheme to Defraud Presents Continuing Opportunities for Defendants to Commit Violations of 18 U.S.C. 1962 (c) and (d)	1606
C.	The MSA Has Not Sufficiently Altered Defendants' Conduct to Justify Not Imposing Appropriate Remedies	1609
D.	As to Certain Defendants, There is Not a Reasonable Likelihood of Future Violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1962 (c) and (d)	1613
1.	CTR	1613
2.	The Tobacco Institute	1615
3.	Liggett	1618
XI.	REMEDIES	1620
A.	Legal Standards Governing Remedies	1620
B.	Specific Remedies	1627
1.	Prohibition of Brand Descriptors	1627
2.	Corrective Communications	1631
3.	Disclosure of Documents and Disaggregated Marketing Data	1636
a.	Depositories	1638
b.	Websites	1640
c.	Privilege Claims	1641

d.	Disaggregated Marketing Data	1642
4.	General Injunctive Provisions	1643
5.	National Smoker Cessation Program	1644
6.	Youth Smoking Reduction Targets	1645
7.	Corporate Structural Changes	1647
8.	Public Education and Countermarketing Campaign	1650
9.	Costs	1651